



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/023,944	12/21/2001	Tetsuo Hishikawa	392.1737	7691

21171 7590 11/04/2003

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
----------

SHUTE, DOUGLAS M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2121

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/023,944

PRG  
Applicant(s)

HISHIKAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Douglas M. Shute

Art Unit

2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/21/01 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5 and 6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-10 are presented for examination.

***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to because the arrows, boxes and labels throughout are hard to read in many places. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2121

4. Claims 1, 5, 6, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saylor (6,084,372) (hereinafter Saylor).

5. As per claim 6, Saylor shows the invention substantially as claimed having a synchronous control apparatus for controlling a follower element in synchronism with a leading element (e.g., figure 9), comprising:

storing means storing data on a positional relationship between the leading element and the follower element in synchronism (e.g., figure 9, element 12); means for performing an acceleration control of the follower element between a motion start position preceding the start position of the synchronism and the start position of the synchronism (e.g., figure 8 and figure 9, element 14 and col. 2, lines 20-27, "The move profile ... master axis"); and means for performing a position control of the follower element based on position data of the leading element and the set positional relationship after the follower element reaches the start position of the synchronism (e.g., figure 8 and figure 9, element 18). Saylor does not specifically show storing data on a start position for starting the synchronism of the follower element and the leading element.

Art Unit: 2121

However, Saylor does show calculation of a point lock (e.g., figure 8) for subsequent use in acceleration control in the system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that data regarding such a point lock could be stored as necessary for future utilization since data storage prior to subsequent use is well known.

6. As per claim 10, it is rejected for reasons given above for claim 6. Further Saylor shows the control of multiple axes based on the position of a first axis. (e.g., col. 4, lines 55-57, "However, the principles ... two axes"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the synchronous control apparatus could store data on positional relationships between the leading element and a plurality of follower elements in synchronism, and data on start positions for starting the synchronism of the plurality of follower elements and the leading element so that the plurality of follower elements are independently controlled in synchronism with the leading element as this would be an obvious extension of control of one following element per claim 6 to the control of plural following elements as a particular circumstance warranted.

7. As per claim 1, it is rejected for reasons given above for claim 6 since claim 1 is a method analogous to the apparatus of claim 6.

8. As per claim 5, it is rejected for reasons as given above for claim 10 since claim 5 is a method analogous to the apparatus of claim 10.

9. Claims 2-4, and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saylor (6,084,372) (hereinafter Saylor) in view of Fugere et al. (5,463,296) (hereinafter Fugere).

10. As per claim 7, it is rejected for reasons as given above for claim 6. Saylor does not specifically show said storing means could store data on the motion start position of the follower element, a linear acceleration line is formed based on the data of the motion start position of the follower element and the data on a start position for starting the synchronism, and a velocity of the follower element is controlled to vary along the linear line from the motion start position to the synchronism start position of the follower element. However, Fugere shows the use of varying types of velocity profile such

Art Unit: 2121

as linear ramp up or down (e.g., col. 1, lines 45-52, "For example, ... higher derivatives.") to control motion between two positions and this velocity profile would provide a corresponding acceleration curve. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the various types of velocity profile (such as linear) of Fugere could be utilized to control system motion to the synchronism start position in Saylor as this would provide overall enhanced system flexibility.

11. As per claim 8, it is rejected for reasons as given above for claim 6. Saylor does not specifically show said storing means could store data on an acceleration curve for synchronizing and the acceleration control is performed according to the acceleration curve so that the position of the follower element when the acceleration terminates coincides with the start position of the synchronization. However, Fugere shows the use of varying types of velocity profile such as linear ramp up or down (e.g., col. 1, lines 45-52, "For example, ... higher derivatives.") to control motion between two positions and this would velocity profile would provide a corresponding acceleration curve. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

Art Unit: 2121

that the various types of velocity profile (such as linear) of Fugere could be utilized to control system motion to the synchronism start position in Saylor as this would provide overall enhanced system flexibility. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the storing means of Saylor could store acceleration curve data as this would be but one of many possible system locations which could be utilized to store this information as a particular circumstance warranted.

12. As per claim 9, it is rejected for reasons as given above for claim 6. Saylor does not specifically show that said storing means could store data on an deceleration curve for deceleration and stop of the follower element, and the follower element is decelerated to be stopped according to the deceleration curve; so that the follower element is brought out of the synchronism. Saylor does show deceleration operation (e.g., col. 8, lines 10-15, " It is understood, ... period"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that a deceleration curve could be stored as this is just a type of acceleration curve and that the follower element could be brought to a stop and hence out of synchronization as



Art Unit: 2121

this is a well known control goal for elements undergoing deceleration.

13. As per claim 2, it is rejected for reasons as given above for claim 7 since claim 2 is a method analogous to the apparatus of claim 7.

14. As per claim 3, it is rejected for reasons as given above for claim 8 since claim 3 is a method analogous to the apparatus of claim 8.


15. As per claim 4, it is rejected for reasons as given above for claim 9 since claim 4 is a method analogous to the apparatus of claim 9.

Art Unit: 2121

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas M. Shute whose telephone number is (703) 305-5615. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anil Khatri can be reached on (703) 305-0282. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

  
October 28, 2003

  
ANIL KHATRI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER